

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
FOR
PRE-SOLICITATION NOTICE

1. **Question:** The qualification process requires that contractor teams be formed prior to the qualification package submittal. Once contractor teams have been selected by Huntsville for the second phase of the procurement, will those contractor teams be permitted to recombine with other selected teams to form new teams, if project requirements dictate other combinations?

Answer: Yes

2. **Question:** Due to the short response time for the qualification package, teaming is made more difficult. Could the qualification package response time be extended to the end of November to allow time for teaming discussions?

Answer: No.

3. **Question:** Since Alaska contractor participation is desired, why are the meetings with Alaska contractors being held after the qualification package is due in Huntsville?

Answer: As stated in the CBD Notice. Additional Industry Briefings will be held in North Dakota and Alaska to maximize local contractor participation.

4. **Question:** What was the rationale for not bidding this project under a fixed price arrangement?

Answer: This was a Government procurement decision to go CPAF.

5. **Question:** Section 1.3 Project Performance Capabilities requires experience in construction of missile launch, below ground structures, physical/electronic security, radar and various support facilities. Over the last five years, there have not been a large number of missile launch and radar facilities constructed. Consequently, there are few companies with this specific experience giving those companies an advantage. If the five year restriction were lifted, more companies could claim missile launch and radar experience from work done earlier.

Answer: Paragraph 1.3 states “The offerors’ work shall be similar in nature” Please refer to Pre-Solicitation Notice, paragraphs 5.1.2.1 and 5.2.2.

6. **Question:** Are the projects to be used in 5.1.2 Submittal the same projects to be used in 5.2.1 Evaluation, 5.2.2 Submittal, and 5.4 Teaming Arrangements? Because of teaming requirements for Phase One and not knowing the precise Scope of Work for Phase Two, attempting to form a team that will satisfy all of the qualification criteria, including experience with missile launch facilities and radar, selecting five projects where team members have worked together will be difficult. It would be important to

allow projects that demonstrate teaming be different ones than those used for Past Experience in 5.1.2.

Answer: Not necessarily – Projects need not be duplicated among sections.

7. **Question:** The audited balance sheets required by section 5.1.2.4 will take up most, if not all, of the 50 pages allowed for pre-qualification response. Please exclude financial information from the page count and provide instructions concerning how the financial information should be treated within the "sequential page numbering" required under section 4.1 (i.e. - provide as an attachment, special page numbering, etc.).

Answer: The financial statement is limited to the Appendix and will not be counted in the 50 pages.

8. **Question:** Will letters of recognition, appreciation or awards be counted as pages?

Answer: No, they are part of your appendices.

9. **Question:** The way pre-solicitation section 5.4.1 is written it appears that the government anticipates that all proposers will structure their organizations to include teaming partners. Does the government believe that the management scope of this project is too broad to be covered by a single contractor? If not, how will an offeror who proposes an organizational approach that does not include external team members be scored under the "Teaming Arrangements" evaluation factor?

Answer: You are not required to team.

10. **Question:** Will you provide a listing on your web site of the firms that are accepted as qualified after the pre-qualification package is complete? This would be very helpful to small firms like mine who can then contact those firms to try and get on teams or provide services.

Answer: Yes, a listing will be available on the web site to maximize subcontractor opportunities.

11. **Question:** It was indicated that for purposes of this solicitation the SIC code is 1542 with small business firm being defined as no more than \$17mm average over the past three years. Does this apply to all work? For example we are a civil engineering firm. Under that SIC code we would be small business but under the A/E SIC code we are not.

Answer: A/E SIC code is irrelevant to this procurement.

12. **Question:** The draft RFP has strong language that teaming partners should have prior experience with each other and that experience should be outlined so that you know you are getting teams that can work together well. I understand that, but this presents a problem with local Alaskan firms. The companies that will prime this are large national and international companies. They will not have much experience with local Alaskan firms. This would seem to discourage them putting such firms on their team. I suspect that is not what you would like to see happen. Maybe you could clarify that some to encourage them to include local firms on their team.

Answer: The teaming arrangements include joint ventures, partnerships and major subcontractors.

13. **Question:** It was indicated this would be a cost reimbursable contract. On a current TERC contract here which the Alaska District has, they told the prime, Jacobs Engineering, that when they had services their teaming partners could do that they still had to get two other competitive bids from other firms and select the low. This has not been done before up here. Will this approach be taken on this contract? If so it will be very difficult to get local firms to agree to be on teams. Why should they help someone get the job and go to that expense if there is no value in being on the team.

Answer: This will be addressed further in the RFP stage.

14. **Question:** Please indicate the Internet site where you are posting the responses to the Industry Forum questions.

Answer: On the Huntsville Engineering and Support Center Home Page (www.hnd.usace.army.mil) to the left, select "Product Lines, then Ballistic Missile Defense Program; about ½ page down, you will see Industry Briefing, Von Braun Convention Center, under which you will find, List of Attendees, Pre-Solicitation Information, and Questions and Answers.

15. **Question:** Has the Bechtel and Raytheon related conflict of interest issue been resolved. Please inform us about your decision.

Answer: With restrictions on who can participate in proposal preparation, Bechtel is allowed to respond to the Presolicitation Notice. The existence and impact of an organizational conflict of interest affecting Raytheon is still being evaluated. Once resolved, the information will be posted on this web site.

16. **Question:** Can two separately pre-qualified prime contractors form a joint venture to respond to the final RFP?

Answer: Yes.

17. **Question:** Section 5.1.2.4 asks for our "audited Income Statements and Balance Sheets for the past three fiscal years." It goes on to request the same information from each team member and currently identified subcontractor. This information typically takes up about 2 pages per company. Depending on the size of the team, this may consume an inordinate number of the 50 pages allowed. Could you please exempt this material from the 50 page limit?

Answer: Exempt from the 50 page.

18. **Question:** Section 4.1 sets the format requirements for the submittal and limits the "typing font" to 10 pt. minimum. Would you please allow a minimum of 9 pts. for use in graphics and for captions to graphics? This slightly smaller font helps us lay out some types of graphics like flowcharts and organization charts.

Answer: No. Please adjust your font accordingly.

19. **Question:** Section 5.1.2.8 asks us to provide a summary of project completion records including "2) whether any awarded work has failed to be completed and reasons why." Throughout our history of performing projects for the government, many projects have not been completed due to congressional funding cuts, reprioritization of funding, or just changes in direction on the part of the government. Could you please clarify that this section is not asking for a listing of these types of project completion records? It appears that your intent was to get a listing of projects that were not completed due to failures or problems caused by the contractor or their poor performance.

Answer: Provide a listing for all the projects.

20. **Question:** Section 5.4 asks for information on our teaming arrangements and our experience working with proposed team mates. If no teaming is planned, how will this section be scored?

Answer: If you do not propose a team, the risk associated with entities not experienced in working together is eliminated and you can expect to score well in this category.

21. **Question:** Section 5.4 indicates that "Firms with no experience teaming with other firms in the proposed team will receive zero points for this evaluation factor." While we recognize that experience working together may lower performance risk for the government, this statement may have an unexpected negative impact on teaming arrangements with small businesses. As Section 5.4 now reads, we would receive zero points for teaming with a small business if we had not worked with them before.

Even though their skill set may be ideal for this job and their performance history may be excellent, we would likely not team with them simply because we do not want to receive a zero under this evaluation factor. Could you please revise this evaluation factor to either: 1) exclude teaming arrangements with small businesses, or 2) weight the points deducted for lack of experience based on the relative importance of the team member to the overall team's ability to qualify? Either approach would allow us to involve new, qualified small businesses where their capabilities complement our own and the lack of experience working together does not raise the government's risk.

Answer: See Amendment 1 to the Pre-Solicitation Notice.

22. **Question:** Section 5.4.2.2 asks for summaries of projects where we have worked with proposed team mates before. This section is followed by a table in which the first block is labeled, "Project title and location." Is this table the format you want us to use in responding to the information requested in the text of Section 5.4.2.2?

Answer: Yes.

23. **Question:** The new Section 5.1.2.9 on safety states, "This information is required for each of the contracts submitted in paragraph 5.1.2.1" when it asks for the Recordable Injury Rates and Cases With Days Away data. Should the reference to 5.1.2.1 really be to 5.2.2? Section 5.2.2 asks us to submit information on specific relevant contracts. Section 5.1.2.1 asks for more general information on our past performance related to several different topics. The other requests for specific data in Section 5.1 (i.e., letters of recognition, and cost reimbursable contract experience) refer to the "experience" section, which is Section 5.2.

Answer: This is correct as is.

24. **Question:** Section 5.3.2.2 asks for "a table of contents of existing procedures." This could be quite voluminous. Could you please exclude this from the 50-page limit?

Answer: Yes. This can be an appendix.

25. **Question:** After reviewing all the information requested by the solicitation, the 50-page limit seems to be very restrictive. Detailed descriptions of our past performance, experience, experience with our teaming partners, technical approach, and quality approach will not be possible within the 50 pages. We will have to summarize or abbreviate in many areas to stay within the page count. Since the instructions say that this Phase I information will not be asked for again in Phase II (if we are invited to proceed to that phase), but will be used in the final selection, we hope you will slightly increase the page limitation to allow bidders to more fully and accurately describe their qualifications. The additional detail we can submit should also help you differentiate between the competitors.

Answer: The limit remains at 50 pages.

26. **Question:** This one deals with Section 1.2 where the requirements for small business subcontracting are explained. We would like to suggest two small wording changes that we believe would help increase the participation of Alaskan- and Indian-owned companies. The underlined text below are the words we hope you will consider adding to Section 1.2.

Offerors should select their teams with the following goals in mind: 61.2% of the work subcontracted should be to Alaska Native Corporations, Tribal, and/or Small Businesses including 9.1% Small Disadvantaged Businesses, 4.5 % Women Owned Businesses, and 1% HUBZone Businesses. The offeror's Corporate Small Business Program Manager should be prepared to execute the solicitation's subcontracting plan. A concern is considered a small business if its annual average gross revenue taken over the last three fiscal years does not exceed \$17 Million. Offerors may satisfy their small business and small disadvantaged subcontracting goals by subcontracting with Indian-Owned concerns meeting the requirements of 10 U.S.C. 2323a.

Answer: We are researching for the answer and a response shall come at a later date.

27. **Question:** Does the "Environmental Compliance Experience" requested under 5.1.2.7 relate to activities normally associated with construction, such as the development and administration of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, or do you seek a broader definition that might include elements that are typically covered under design such as hazardous material investigation or activities relating to environmental impact studies?

Answer: We are looking for things normal to construction.